UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,300	04/23/2001	Yuefeng Liu	6502.0333	3107

60667 7590 01/25/2007 SUN MICROSYSTEMS/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413	**EXAMINER** NGUYEN, PHUONGCHAU BA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/839,300	LIU, YUEFENG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuongchau Ba Nguyen	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10-25-6_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-37_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) _1-16 and 37_ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _27-36_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) ___ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _9-25-6, 1-12-7_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole
> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by
> the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kompella (7,136,374) in view of Satyanarayanan (6,662,198).

Regarding claims 27 and 32,

        Kompella discloses transport networks supporting virtual private

networks, and configuring such networks. Kompella discloses *a method for*

communicating between a first private network (network at site 0-fig.2) *and a*

second private network (network at site 3-fig.2*) configured from nodes* (CE$_0$-

CE$_5$, fig.2, see col.7, lines 9-28 wherein the CEs to be identified with a VPN to

which they belong; and col.8, lines 30-32 wherein the transport network

supports a separate VPN for each of the customers) *in a public network*

infrastructure (transport network 210-fig.2), *comprising:*

   means for receiving a non-tunneled *packet from a source node* (CE$_0$) *in*

the first private network (site 0), see column 7, lines 2-10;

   means for determining whether the packet (from CE$_0$) *is destined for the*

second private network (CE$_5$ at site 5, col.7, lines 25-28 & col.8, lines 30-32),

see column 7, lines 29-56;

   (1) *means for obtaining an address mapping corresponding to the*

destination node (inner label associated with the destination customer edge

device C$_5$, col.7, lines 40-56 & col.8, lines 2-32) *and acquiring a channel key*

(channel identifier, col.7, lines 44-49) *associated with a channel based on the*

determination, see figs. 2-5, 9-10, 17-18.

   (2) *means for sending the packet over a channel* (LSP-label switched path,

fig.6) *to the destination node using the address mapping, the address mapping*

reflecting a relationship between (a) *an internal address for the destination*

node for use in communicating among nodes in the second private network

(inner label, 840-fig.8) *and* (b) *an external address* (outer label, 830-fig.8) *for*

the destination node suitable for communicating over the public network

infrastructure (transport network-MPLS).

Kompella discloses all the claimed limitations, except (1) CEs belong to

different virtual private network.

Kompella further discloses in column 7, lines 25-28 that the present

invention may do so by permitting different customer edge devices (CEs) to be

identified with a VPN to which they belong, and to uniquely within a VPN,

address, such as CEs. However, in the same field of endeavor, Satyanarayanan

(6,662,198) discloses server database node 12 for mapping the destination of

packet of network A to network B, see fig.15 (corresponding to (1)). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to an artisan to apply Satyananrayanan's teaching to

Kompella's system with the motivation being to prevent unauthorized access to

files and data which must remain segregated between private networks.

Regarding claims 28 and 33, Kompella further discloses when the data packet

sending from an end-station CE $_0$ to CE $_5$-fig.2, the packet is encapsulated with

the inner label for transmission to a destination node CE $_5$ in the transport

network, see 440-450, fig.4, (corresponding to *means for adding the external*

address to the packet)

Regarding claims 29 and 34, Kompella discloses all the claimed limitations,

except (1) *encrypting the packet.*

However, in the same field of endeavor, Satyanarayanan (6,662,192)

discloses encrypting key to all data in transit (fig.2, step 196)(corresponding to

(1)). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to apply

Satyanarayanan's teaching to Kompella's system with the motivation being to

provide secured data being accessed with authorization.

Regarding claims 30 and 35, Kompella discloses all the claimed limitations,

except (1) *means for accessing the address mapping based on a determination*

that the packet is destined for the second private network.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Satyanarayanan (6,662,198)

discloses server database node 12 for mapping the destination of packet of

network A to network B, see fig.15 (corresponding to (1)). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to an artisan to apply Satyananrayanan's teaching to

Kompella's system with the motivation being to prevent unauthorized access to

files and data which must remain segregated between private networks.

Regarding claims 31 and 36, Kompella discloses all the claimed limitations,

except (1) *determining whether an address mapping exists for a destination*

address in the packet.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Satyanarayanan discloses the

received packet being determined for access or denial, see col.11, lines 6-17 &

47-63, as if authorized, address is existed for indicating the authorization—

emphasis added. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to apply

Satyanarayanan's teaching to Kompella's system with the motivation being to

provide access to data to only authorized users.

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claims 1-16, 37 allowed over the prior art.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to Phuongchau Ba Nguyen whose

telephone number is 571-272-3148. The examiner can normally be reached

on Monday-Friday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 571-272-7629. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

Phuongchau Ba Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2616

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600